

MAY 20, 1952
717th BROADCAST

Town Meeting

Illinois U Library



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 300 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

How Can the Western Democracies Avert World War III?

Moderator, MARQUIS CHILDS

S p e a k e r s

JOHN W. BRICKER

OWEN J. ROBERTS

—★—
COMING

—May 27, 1952—

**Who Are the Troublemakers In Our
Democracy?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 3  \$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 18

No. 3



How Can the Western Democracies Avert World War III?

The broadcast of May 20, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p. m. EDT, over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated in the Ballroom of the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, under the auspices of the Atlantic Union Committee of Philadelphia.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

OWEN J. ROBERTS—Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States from 1930 until his retirement in 1945. Until recently he served as Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, of which he is a graduate and has been a professor. Roberts began his career as a practicing lawyer in Philadelphia in 1898. He later became Assistant District Attorney of Philadelphia County and during the first World War, a Special Deputy Attorney General. He aroused national acclaim as special prosecutor for the "Teapot Dome" investigation in 1923-24. During the second World War he was Chairman of the War Department Advisory Board on Clemency and a member of the President's Amnesty Board. In January, 1949, he joined in founding the Atlantic Union Committee and has been its President ever since.

SENATOR JOHN W. BRICKER—Republican of Ohio. Bricker was born in Pleasant Township, Ohio, in 1893 and completed his formal education with an LL.B. degree at Ohio State University. From 1917-18 he served as a First Lieutenant in the United States Army. Bricker began his legal practice in Columbus where he has continued except when holding public office. His posts with the Ohio State government included Assistant Attorney General (1923-27); Member, Public Utilities Commission (1929-32); Governor, State of Ohio (1939-45). He was nominated the Republican candidate for Vice-President of the United States in 1944. In 1947 he was elected to the U. S. Senate, where he is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Moderator: MARQUIS CHILDS—Author and syndicated columnist for United Features.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

How Can the Western Democracies Avert World War III?

Announcer:

From the Grand Ballroom in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia, America's Town Meeting brings you a discussion on a vital international subject. Tonight's broadcast is under the auspices of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee, which has brought Town Meeting to this city as a community project.

The Honorable Owen J. Roberts, one of our speakers, has been Chairman of the Philadelphia Atlantic Union group since it was founded in 1950, and he also heads the national organization. Through an intensive program of lectures and public relations under the direction of Dr. Allan Lake Rice, Executive Secretary, the Philadelphia Atlantic Union Chapter has been particularly active in giving voice to its belief that the Atlantic Union is the best way to rally democratic nations against the threat of communism. As the result of its activities, the Chapter's membership has nearly doubled in the past year.

Now to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion, here is the well-known author, lecturer and syndicated columnist for United Features, Marquis Childs.

Moderator Childs:

Tonight we are the guests of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee, speaking from the Grand Ballroom of the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel. Most Americans are today asking themselves this very question, "How can we avert World War III?" I must seem in moments of pessimism that a divided world is grinding inevitably toward the

catastrophe. Again, the intense efforts being made to secure peace must encourage us to believe that there is indeed light at the end of the tunnel.

One thing we have not lacked in this period of cold and lukewarm war. From every side have come plans, formulas, prescriptions on how to keep the peace and thereby save the world. Two distinguished speakers will give us two different viewpoints on this fundamental question.

Here in Philadelphia, Justice Owen J. Roberts began his career in the law. The climax of that career was his appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1945, after fifteen years of service, he retired to become a gentleman farmer at Chester Springs, but he has been even more active than he was on the Court and his most absorbing activity is as national chairman of the Atlantic Union Committee.

In his native Ohio, before he came to Washington, Senator John W. Bricker, a Republican, also began with the practice of law. In politics, he was three times Governor, serving from 1939 to 1945, and he is now running for a second term in the Senate. One of his continuing concerns, currently expressed in the Constitutional amendment he has sponsored, is to safeguard American sovereignty.

And now we shall hear first from Justice Roberts. (*Applause*)

Justice Roberts:

We in the Atlantic Union feel that the only way to avert World War III, in fact, to avert world wars of any kind, is to introduce in the world a system of law, order

under law, and consequent peace.

We know of no way to maintain peace, domestically or otherwise, except by government of laws which affect free men and those laws to be made by the representatives of those free men. Everything else has been tried, and nothing seems to be a panacea against war.

We believe in the bold approach of asking people who are like-minded, who want peace and order and want to live under that kind of a system, to find a way to unite themselves, their power, their spiritual and their economic and physical resources in a single body to maintain their freedoms and their way of life.

Moderator Childs:

Thank you, Justice Roberts. And now, Senator Bricker, the floor is yours.

Senator Bricker:

Mr. Childs and Justice Roberts, first of all, let me say that I certainly most heartily commend Justice Roberts for his zealous advocacy of a cause to which he is devoting his years. I am one who favors the exploring of every avenue possible for the preservation of peace in the world.

I do not believe it is possible through any world government, or through any Atlantic Union, such as is advocated. The United States, its strength, its liberty, and its sovereignty are the cornerstone for the building of a peaceful world; and to the degree that we weaken the sovereignty of our country, the liberty of our people, our voice in the affairs of the world, as an individual independent nation, we weaken the hope of the peoples of the world for peaceful relationships. Although commending the efforts, I disagree with the plan. (Applause)

Mr. Childs: Thank you, Senator Bricker. Well, gentlemen, there is a wide area of disagreement between you. I would like very much to hear Justice Roberts' comment on Senator Bricker's remarks.

Justice Roberts: The first criticism I have is that if I understand Senator Bricker he wants the United States to take a sort of a hegemony over the whole world, to build itself up so strongly that it can lead the world. I do not know whether he advocates a second Roman Empire or not. Perhaps a second British Empire.

He must advocate either that, or he must advocate building a wall around us, letting Europe go hang, letting all the free peoples of the world go hang and take their own chance with this terrible threat that comes from the Kremlin, and try to live alone, walled in.

I think no nation can live to itself alone, walled off from trade, from communication, and from every other means of contact with the other nations of the world. I don't think we can make ourselves strong enough—if we let Russia take over all the rest of the world, with all its resources and all its people—to stand alone and effectively turn back the threat of communist domination.

Mr. Childs: Senator, has the Justice misinterpreted your point?

Senator Bricker: No, but he has forgotten the only plan, I think, that will really bring peace in the world. I have for my country no imperialistic designs. I don't think any patriotic American has any imperialistic designs to build a world empire, either patterned upon Rome or the British Empire. We've seen them both rise and fall, and we do not want to fall any sooner than we have to in this country.

Likewise, we have seen an effective and cooperative effort on the part of the United States and the nations of Europe. Our cooperation has been greater than theirs has been. We have joined in the United Nations, we have joined in the Atlantic Pact, both of which I supported this time within the proper limits of their powers, and at this time Europe is, I believe, becoming revitalized—very slowly, but if they do not of their own accord, there is not the possibility of their doing it in an Atlantic Union if they cannot do it cooperatively.

The Justice has spoken of Russia as the enemy. We all recognize Russia and godless, ruthless, tyrannical communism as the enemy of the peaceful life that we want to live and of the liberties that our peoples enjoy in this country; and yet if the union that he advocates and his group advocates is brought about, there is only one cause for it—and that's apparent in Justice Roberts' statement here—and that is the fear of Russia. It will be sort of a shotgun union, and that union will not be bullet-proof, anymore than the cooperative organization that is now set up, which will ultimately strengthen free people rather than taking away the freedom which they already have.

Mr. Childs: If I understand Senator Bricker correctly, Justice Roberts, he says he is for the Atlantic Alliance, as it exists today, and he is for, with limitations, the United Nations. I would like to get your view on the efficacy of the United Nations at the present.

Justice Roberts: I think the United Nations was a great step forward. I think it was probably as far as you could get the nations to go after the Second World War. I think it has a great function, many great functions, to perform

in international relations. But I think it was completely oversold to the American people and to the free people of the world as a sure-fire protection against war.

We all know now that it isn't that. Everybody agrees that whatever good there is in it, and I'm for it for everything it can do for us and I'm for staying in it with every vigor that we have, but we all realize that it will not keep the peace, and that's the point.

Senator Bricker admits it won't keep the peace, because he says he's for the Atlantic Treaty Organization. So am I. That was another step. But I say the Atlantic Treaty Organization won't and can't contain Russia, and why? Well, the Commanding Officer of the armies over there, now General Ridgeway, formerly General Eisenhower, has twelve bosses. They are twelve sovereign bosses. He's got to clear every policy and he'll have to conduct whatever military operations he ever conducts with the consent of twelve, and a veto of one will break the chain. That's exactly the difficulty with the League of Nations. It's exactly the difficulty with the United Nations.

And the difficulty is the thing that Senator Bricker lays most stress on—sovereignty: Don't give up any of your national sovereignty. Reserve your right to act or not to act in each exigency according to your own selfish motives and your own nationalistic interests. In that way, you never get real cooperation.

I'm for cooperation, but I'm for cooperation between people, not between selfish governments.

Senator Bricker: I don't believe, Justice Roberts, that you can accuse this country of being selfish in its motives. We have shown throughout a hundred and fifty years of our national life and

more, especially during the end of World War and emphasized during the Second World War, that this is a compassionate nation, that we are willing to cooperate, we'll give of our substance, we'll help those who will go along with us. And I think that I'd rather attribute to our country noble motives and a desire for a better kind of life, and to help the other people, rather than a selfish motive. After all, I'm selfish enough to want to preserve the Constitution of the United States, the liberties of the American people which are recognized as we recognize them here and no place else in the whole world; and if we give up a part of that sovereignty we become a minor voice in the Atlantic Union.

Then it will not be the noble purposes of the United States. It will not be the patriotic program. It will not be a recognition of the compassion of the people of America. But we will be subject to the control of any other nations that might be in there which would outvote us, and I think that you will have to agree with me that selfishness has been an attribute of many other nations in the world more than it has been of this free country of ours.

Justice Roberts: Well, it depends on what you mean by selfishness, of course. That's my point—that nationalistic policies blot out the larger vision.

Here we have two friendly nations, Britain and ourselves, who haven't been able to agree on a policy in China. Here we have a number of friendly nations, all of whom agree to our action in Korea, but they merely agree to it; they have but token forces over there. We've no way but persuasion to get them to do more, to get them to strike hands with us.

Of course, this is a generous nation, and this nation is going to bankrupt itself if it keeps on being generous, as it's been in the last years, because we're doing this thing in a totally wrong way. We are advancing money, and we're advancing military aid nationalistically to nations, and we're wasting untold treasure when, if we were a common pot, a common people, spending a single defense budget, a single foreign affairs budget, we'd save of the order of 60 per cent of what is being spent in the world today for a loose-jointed impossible organization.

Senator Bricker: Justice Roberts, I think it was one of your very distinguished colleagues on the great Court that said at one time that a page of history is worth a tome of logic. Let us look to the history of Europe and see whether or not if they had control of the United States or the people of the United States and the utilization of our monies and the direction of our military forces they would have been interested any more in Korea than they are at the present time, whether or not the desires for trade, whether or not the selfish interests of those people that have been cut across for now a millennium, with nationalistic instincts and interests. And when you realize that England has refused even to the present time to join in a cooperative effort in Europe as far as armies are concerned, and even has refused to join in the Schuman Plan for a cooperative arrangement in the mining of coal and possibly in other industries, when you realize that France is an unstable government—she has gone far beyond in the desires of personal liberty than is consistent with orderly government—and when we join with them we do not strengthen the people of Eur-

...ppe, but we weaken ourselves, and the world is dependent upon us by precept and by example, by the freedom that we have, by the great productive powers that we have in this country. Our influence can be mightier if we remain free and sovereign, than if we join up with any other group that will of course out-vote us.

Now I'd like to ask you a question, Justice Roberts. I know that you cannot, as a leader of this group here, now say what the details would be of that government. I only have to rely upon the testimony before our committees in the Congress. Just how would it work out as far as military forces are concerned, as far as taxation is concerned, and the creation of the governmental institutions for the peoples of the Atlantic Union?

Justice Roberts: It will never work unless a majority of the people in all the countries that are asked to join believe that they ought to join together in the common effort. I quite agree with you, Senator Bricker, that the people of the United States can't join this movement without a Constitutional amendment. You yourself have the legislative power conferred by the people of the United States. You have no right to delegate that to any other legislator, and you can't, Congress can't, and over these powers to any international parliament.

You ask whether we won't be outvoted by other countries. Well, what is reminiscent of 1787, isn't it? The little states were all afraid to go into federation because they said the big states would vote them down all the time. But don't you see, the minute you put people together in a common pot and they each contribute by their talents to a common effort and each

nation has representation according to what he pays in the way of taxes, as he very well may, in this intended parliament or congress, you won't be outvoted by nations. We're going to have this parliament represent people. I think, today, the Senators from Ohio do not vote locally. I think the Senators from Ohio vote in the interest of all the people of the United States. I'd be sorry to think otherwise, and I don't think it's a question today in the United States of New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania getting together outvoting any small states in the United States. We've got a larger vision. Can't we get that larger vision in a larger group, a group of people who have common interests, common backgrounds, common traditions, and common ambitions? (*Applause*)

Senator Bricker: History to that question says the answer is *no*, Justice. We have here in this country, and I'm reminded of what an actuary at one time told me—an actuary is one who sits out in infinity and watches parallel lines meet—the history of our country is one of common people with common purposes and common ways of life, homogeneous people. Our territory is contiguous. In Europe they have contiguous territory, of course, but they do not have homogeneous population there, and there has been an effort—there is now a resolution in the Senate of the United States to the effect that we ought to encourage—I did not join it, because I don't think it's our business to mess in other nations' business as to what they should do internally—and yet urging a common government in Europe. England has already declined to take part in that, and there is no support for it among the other

countries of Europe. The old enmities, the cross currents of hatred there, are such that if they can't unite in Europe, certainly there is no hope for a union with this country, unless they look to us as a source of money, as a source of military strength, which will be used at their instance rather than ours.

Mr. Childs: I would like to ask you, Senator Bricker, if I may, what effect your constitutional amendment would have—your proposed amendment—in further restricting the ability of the United States to delegate sovereignty, and I would like to hear Justice Roberts comment on that amendment, if he will.

Senator Bricker: In the first place, the amendment which I suppose that you mean, is Senate Resolution 130. That's up for presentation of testimony tomorrow morning before the judiciary committee, of the Senate. It was joined by 58 other senators.

The import of that amendment is this: That no treaty law shall violate the terms of the Constitution of the United States, nor abrogate the rights of the American people under the Bill of Rights, and that executive agreements which have been the practice of the last 10 or 15 years on the part of the President of the United States shall not be used in lieu of treaty. And recognizing that treaties when adopted by the President and ratified by two-thirds of the voting senators, if the quorum is present, become the supreme law of the land.

A further provision is made that if there is an abrogation of a state statute, a nullification of a state constitution, or an act of the Congress, that that shall have to be ratified by a vote of both houses of the Congress. I look upon the

Bill of Rights of this country which recognizes, as no other nation in time has recognized, and they are debating this very thing in Parliament in Canada now, that people have under natural law inalienable rights, given by God, divinely inspired, not given by government and therefore cannot be taken away by government. All nations with whom Justice Roberts and his group would have us join think of human rights, individual rights, as something that government gives to people, and if government gives them, governments can take them away from us; and if by treaty law, we can abrogate the rights of American citizens under the United Nations sub-committees, whatever it might be, then we have destroyed our sovereignty just as effectively as if we entered into this international union that is being advocated by Justice Roberts.

My provision would protect the inalienable rights of the American citizens against treaty law. (*Applause*)

Mr. Childs: I would like to hear Justice Roberts comment whether he thinks such an amendment would prevent or would hinder the movement toward world federation.

Justice Roberts: No, I'm going to surprise Senator Bricker worse than he's been surprised in years. I agree entirely with his amendment and I would be for its adoption.

Now, why? I'll tell you why. The United Nations is an inter-governmental treaty. In the United Nations, they've set up certain committees which are just committees appointed by the United Nations Organization. Those committees are submitting treaties that affect the conduct of individual citizens in the countries. Now my

liberties and my rights can't be affected except I have a chance to vote, and all my fellowmen have a chance to vote, and I don't want any *ad hoc* committee specifying what my rights are, and my government, so I agree entirely with the Senator.

But I disagree with him heartily that all the democracies that we ask to join believe that government gives rights. Not at all. A British citizen can fight his government in the courts just as you and I can against transgression. So can a French citizen. So in every one of the countries that we ask to join in this union at the start, the people are the supreme rulers. They make laws through their representatives. (*Applause*)

Senator Bricker: Is there any right that an English citizen has that Parliament cannot take away?

Justice Roberts: Yes, sir.

Senator Bricker: What are they?

Justice Roberts: Why, there are many of them. The courts have repeatedly said that something that was attempted to be done was contrary to the British Constitution, although it's not.

Senator Bricker: That constitution may be abrogated.

Mr. Childs: We have two great constitutional lawyers here, and I hate to interrupt them, but we've come to one of the interesting phases of the Town Meeting, which is the question phase. We'll hear now some questions from the floor.

★

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Man: Senator Bricker, since you believe in exploring every avenue toward peace, why are you opposed to a conference to explore whether the American idea of federation can't be carried further?

Senator Bricker: Because this conference is based upon the wrong premise, and I don't want to give it the approval of the Congress of the United States.

First of all, this is impractical for several reasons, and I wish that Justice Roberts would detail the kind of government—I know it's unfair to ask just one citizen to do it or one advocate to do it—but you've got to have a government, you've got to have some kind of a parliament or a congress, you've got to have either a constitutional government or a parliamentary system, you've got to adopt either a private enterprise system of industry or a socialistic program, and I just don't believe

in exploring this at the present time when there is no possibility of working out a practical answer to it with all the difficulties of language, kinds of government, the antipathies and the antagonisms that are present in Europe today on so many matters.

Justice Roberts: He sounds like the people who were opposed to the Constitution of the United States.

Man: I think your answer means that you are in favor of exploring every avenue that you personally approve of.

Senator Bricker: I am in favor of exploring any avenue that doesn't deprive the American citizens of their right to their own government and doesn't in any way reflect upon the sovereignty of the United States.

Man: Justice Roberts, will policing bring peace to the world?

Justice Roberts: It depends on what you mean by policing. We have peace nationally, and we have a police force, but we have a police force to enforce the will of the majority. When the majority in this country ceases to believe in the laws of this country, no police force can enforce them. Now you've got to have a government that is government by the people.

Man: Senator Bricker, how long will we have to try to support the world's economy without world government?

Senator Bricker: I don't think we can support the world's economy very much longer on the basis that we are supporting at the present time. The United States must preserve her own resources and must keep herself strong because if we fall, the world falls with us.

Lady: Justice Roberts, how does the present United States Congress stand in favor of the Atlantic Union?

Justice Roberts: So far as we know there are 28 Senators who have said they would support the resolution to investigate the possibility of Atlantic Union and more than a quarter of the House of Representatives have also so declared.

Man: Senator Bricker, you're a United States Senator, sir, and my question is: where would you be today, if your views opposing federation were adopted in this country in 1787? (*Laughter*)

Senator Bricker: I was not here in 1787 and I had no views on it at that time, but I tried to point out that there is an entirely different situation confronting the world today than what confronted the colonies at that time.

Man: The question, Senator, is

where would you be today if your views opposing federation . . .

Senator Bricker: I might say that silly questions require silly answers and I don't like to give them.

Justice Roberts: I know where he'd be. He wouldn't be a citizen of Ohio, because we would have had no country, and Ohio would have fallen with the rest, long ago.

Senator Bricker: But there was an entirely different problem in the United States from what there is in the world today. We came here to this country to get away from the kind of things that were prevalent in Europe and we formed a government different from anything else in the world and I want it kept here.

Lady: Justice Roberts, if the Atlantic Union will not take any nation in except it be a democracy, how long will it take to get a world union, remembering that so few nations are democracies?

Justice Roberts: There are at least a dozen nations that I should say under the definition of free representative government could join now. World government is a far goal. Our idea is that if we can once demonstrate that the more advanced democracies can live in peace and amity with each other, we shall have set an example and cause a movement toward free democratic living that will bring one government after another in with us. But it will take years.

Man: This question is for Senator Bricker. Granted the world needs our leadership, as you have said, Senator, how is it possible that we can lead with simply being content to maintain our own separate security, refusing to take the risks of leadership?

Senator Bricker: We have taken the leadership and we've got the leadership in the world today, maybe thrust upon us, some are willing to assume it. But let me present to you the impossibility—I asked Justice Roberts a moment ago about the details of this union. I picked it up from the testimony before our committee which says that there will be no immigration restrictions. Think of the millions that will come to the United States, there will be a control of industry, agriculture and resources, and I'll be outvoted. There will be a common currency. I don't know what that would be. Somebody suggested down in the Senate the other day that we would call the new medium of currency the "sheafauver" or the "Coonskin" so that if you drove up to a store you could trade a bushel of Keeney's for a peck of potatoes, or something like that, that there would be free trade between the countries, that they would have control of the armed forces and the right to commit them to the services, that there would be a complete control of foreign affairs. Now I know that those powers maybe the very minimum, but the power of government grows and the greatest enemy in the world—I think the Justice will agree with me on this—the greatest enemy of human liberty to which I have devoted my life, individual rights, is the power of government itself and that power grows. I remember, Justice Roberts, when you rendered an opinion in the Butler case, and it was picked up and later made a precedent which expanded the constitutional authority in this country to an unlimited degree, and that would be true of any government.

Justice Roberts: I think the

Senator answers himself. He suggests that we must have no government because all government, except our own little sovereign tight-walled government, is bad. If you've got that point of view, then you just put a wall around yourself and live within yourself.

Senator Bricker: No, I don't advocate that, and I never have advocated that. If you can't cooperate, you can't marry them.

Mr. Childs: I can see that our questioner is not quite satisfied.

Man: I recognize that details of the plan may be subject to a great difficulty of solution; however, the principal question is what I'm asking you to answer. How can we lead without assuming the risks? Granted that there will be a great deal of difficulty involved in working out the plan, a leader has got to take those risks. Why can't we take the risks? Someone has to.

Senator Bricker: We have taken those risks and if we joined in an Atlantic Union we will not have the responsibility. The responsibility of leadership will have passed from the shores of America and will be dominated by the people of Europe, whether it is leadership in foreign affairs, or maybe in taxation.

Man: This is a question for Justice Roberts. Would the Atlantic Union be likely, in your opinion, sir, to reduce our present immigration quotas in an effort to effect a more perfect union?

Justice Roberts: Oh, this immigration question is a great bugbear. The peoples who have come into the Atlantic Union have had but very small quotas over the last twenty years. Even in the depths of war and depression in Europe, they haven't filled their quotas. People stay at home, they

stay where their *mores* are, where their ancestors are buried. They don't race around. England's having a terrible time to get enough immigration to go to Australia, one of her own commonwealth. I don't fear the bug-bear at all.

Senator Bricker: At the present time most of the quotas are subscribed in the European countries. They told me yesterday that one or two of them were up to the year 2000, from the applications that are at the present time pending. I think that if you'd open up this country to unlimited immigration from the countries which have joined the Atlantic Union, and those that might come in later, we would have an unemployment situation that would not prevent world war but would bring communism to this country.

Mr. Childs: Now we have another question from the floor.

Man: This is to Senator Bricker. Will not these continuing alliances with the European nations tend to lower our standard of living to their level rather than raise theirs to ours?

Senator Bricker: I don't think they would if we were careful and cautious of our program in the years that are ahead. It could ultimately result in that. I am one that opposes it but I do know that if we join a union in a government way, that we will not only reach them but we will be dragged down to their level rather than bringing them up to ours which we hope to do under the present arrangement.

Lady: Justice Roberts, why wouldn't it be more satisfactory to have one union of all countries of the world rather than two conflicting groups?

Justice Roberts: Well, it would,

but how are you going to form a union with communist China or communist Russia? You cannot form a union of an autocracy and a democracy. In a democracy all power comes from the people. In an autocracy, all power comes from one or a little group of men. Russia couldn't come into a democratic form of government because they won't have any law bind them and they want to instruct their delegates always to act the way the central power specifies, not the way the people vote. You can't do that.

Man: Senator Bricker, our own history shows the failure of federation short of a pooling of sovereignty. Why can we expect better on the international level?

Senator Bricker: I didn't get the import of the question.

Man: The import of the question is that in our own history we have seen that united effort short of a pooling of sovereignty has been a failure. Why, in view of your emphasis of the greater likelihood of our own creating a united nation better than that in Europe or elsewhere, why can we expect better on the international level?

Senator Bricker: I still don't get it.

Mr. Childs: I gather the questioner means that since we have successfully solved federation here by pooling the sovereignty of the states, why is it not logical to expect we will be successful on the international level; is that correct?

Man: Well, the question is stronger than that. I understood the Senator's remarks earlier explaining why it was easier for us to have a union here than to have an international union. Our experience has been that even though

have been more homogeneous than a world population, we have been unable to be successful except if we pool sovereignty. How can we expect for better success in a less homogeneous international world? (Applause)

Senator Bricker: I disagree with you that we haven't been a success in our effort here in this country.

Justice Roberts: We're a great failure under the Article of Confederation and that's why you had to form a federation.

Senator Bricker: But we have a government here that I think has been the finest in the history of time with more liberty to people, greater productive capacity, more influence, a better way of life, and I don't want to adulterate

Man: Justice Roberts, if the United Nations can't stop the Korean conflict with its present equipment, how would the Atlantic Union improve this situation?

Justice Roberts: Why, it would improve it enormously. In the first place it would have a single army, a single navy, drawn from all the countries that were constituents. It would have one single policy, foreign policy, and one single military policy, and you'd spread this risk over all the nations.

Lady: Senator Bricker, don't you think the European countries might be more willing to join a union if the United States was a member than they would to join a European Federation without the United States?

Senator Bricker: I don't see why they would. General Eisenhower has advocated a European union. Premier Churchill did it one time when he was premier, and there has been no effort on their part,

and I don't think there will be any effort on their part to cooperate with us any better in the union in the Korean incident, for instance, or in the furnishing of soldiers for any other purpose than there is at the present time.

Lady: Well, they are in the United Nations, but they haven't gone along with the Schuman Plan and other things in Europe, so by that token they might join.

Senator Bricker: They've gone along with the Truman Plan by accepting our money.

Man: Justice Roberts, how will the Atlantic Union relieve the peoples of the lethal burden of the cost of armament and defense mobilization?

Justice Roberts: It won't as long as we have the communist threat, but it will spread it fairly according to the amount of taxable valuation of the countries that are in it—spread it fairly and not waste it. We're wasting it now horribly.

Senator Bricker: What kind of a tax, Justice Roberts, would be advocated?

Justice Roberts: I'd advocate a levy on each nation according to its taxable capacity, and I'd give it representation in the parliament according to the amount of taxes it paid. We'd pay the largest amount.

Man: For Senator Bricker, a specific question. Without an Atlantic Union what international machinery would be available in case of a new blockade of Berlin?

Senator Bricker: We had one blockade in Berlin and it worked out very effectively, I think. Of course, you can't write the mistakes in the Berlin situation that were made by putting an island out there without an ingress or egress to it—that's one of the

blunders that can't be corrected in anyway by an Atlantic Union or any other kind of a compact.

Mr. Childs: You wouldn't agree, Senator Bricker, that perhaps the UN would be effective there?

Senator Bricker: Oh, no. The U. N. was effective.

Justice Roberts: The United States did it all.

Senator Bricker: They did all the work, as they are doing in Korea, and they have spent all the money.

Mr. Childs: Gentlemen, I'm sorry our time has come to close. Thank you very much, Justice Roberts, and you, Senator Bricker, for your constructive discussion and thanks to Town Meeting's host, the Philadelphia Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee and its Executive Secretary, Dr. Allan Lake Rice. Town Hall also expresses its appreciation to the management and staff of station WFIL, ABC in Philadelphia. So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.



Gift Subscriptions

The *Town Meeting Bulletin* is a welcome gift for any occasion. Why not subscribe for your friends who are Town Meeting listeners? The Bulletin is \$5.00 a year. Address your order to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. Are our present policies successful deterrents to World War III?
 - a. Is NATO making Europe strong enough to withstand aggression and provide real security?
 - b. Is our Mutual Security Program averting war?
 - c. Is our atomic superiority enough to preclude war?
 - d. Could we avert World War III better by a firm retreat to our shores and strengthening ourselves economically and militarily?
2. Are alliances sufficient to prevent war, or is an economic and political union, such as Atlantic Union, necessary?
 - a. Under NATO, each signatory is obliged to consider an attack on one as an attack on itself. Can Atlantic Union offer any stronger assurance of collective defense than this?
 - b. Would Atlantic Union be considered by the Communist countries as a threat to their security, and would they retaliate by forming a similar organization, thus emphasizing the "two world" concept?
 - c. Would Atlantic Union alienate the countries now included in NATO, but not eligible for Atlantic Union membership? If so, would this divide the free world and limit the effectiveness of our defenses?
 - d. Would Atlantic Union drive the countries which are not accepted for membership towards the Russian orbit? Or would these countries tend toward "neutralism?"
 - e. Would Atlantic Union strain our relations with Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East?
 - f. How would Atlantic Union help avert the start of a third world war in the Middle East or Asia?
3. Is Atlantic Union practical?
 - a. Would a union of the North Atlantic democracies be as successful as federation has been in the United States, Canada, and Switzerland, or are the Atlantic countries too heterogeneous?
 - b. How would Atlantic Union affect American sovereignty and individual freedom?
 - c. How would Atlantic Union affect American living standards?
 - d. How would Atlantic Union affect the value of the American dollar?
 - e. Could American free enterprise co-exist with British socialism in Atlantic Union?
 - f. Are countries still too nationalistic for regional international government?

JUN 2 1952

BEHIND THE CRIER'S BELL



Few people realize the enormous amount of spade-work that goes into selection of Town Meeting topics and speakers.

It takes all the time of one staff member and generous portions of six others to read, evaluate, clip, classify and file the quantities of reading material to which Town Hall subscribes. Six New York dailies and approximately thirty-five magazines—representing all shades of opinion—are on the “must” list. The latter include the weekly news-magazines, *Harpers'*, *The Freeman*, *Saturday Review of Literature*, *Collier's*, *Reader's Digest*, *The Nation*, radio trade publications and “women's” magazines.

Also receiving close attention are U. S. Government bulletins, the Kiplinger Letter, and at least fifty publications from organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers, American Civil Liberties Union, American Legion, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, Federation of Women's Clubs, Rotarians, National Education Association, the Embassies and national information centers.

After items of interest are clipped, they are filed in 300 categories according to subject. Most of the labels are obvious: Asia, Atom, Australia, etc., but a few may seem bizarre: Calendar Reform, Existentialism, Ideological Warfare, Semantics.

Town Meeting research does not end here. In addition to the files of clippings and pamphlets, is the card file. This consists of reports on other radio programs, especially forums and speeches, cross-indexed as to subject, speaker, and speaker's location.

This information storehouse serves several purposes. It provides invaluable background material for the use of speakers and moderator; it is the basis for developing discussion issues pertinent to the program topic. Also, it is the source of ideas for future “Town Meeting” topics and participants.

Other perennial reference aids to the program department are *Who's Who*, the *World Almanac*, a twenty-volume encyclopedia, a world atlas, the *Government Manual* and the *Congressional Directory*. Luckily the *Directory* is issued every year . . . for with the constant checking of committee membership and other facts on frequently-appearing Congressmen, this book gets reduced to shreds.